arXiv:1602.04071v1 [math.AP] 12 Feb 2016

Weak Solutions for Singular Quasilinear Elliptic Systems

Gurpreet Singh
School of Mathematics and Statistics
University College Dublin,
Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland
E-mail: gurpreet.singh@ucdconnect.ie

12 February, 2016

Abstract

We investigate the quasilinear elliptic system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = u^{-p}v^{-q}, u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_m v = u^{r}v^{-s}, v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{0.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N (N \geq 1)$ is a bounded and smooth domain, $1 < m < \infty$, $p, q, r, s > 0$. Under certain conditions imposed on the exponents we obtain the existence and uniqueness of a weak solution (u, v) with $u,\ v \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$. We also investigate the $W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega)$ regularity of solution and determine the optimal range of $\tau \geq m$ for such regularity.

Keywords: Singular quasilinear elliptic systems, m-Laplace operator, weak solution, singular nonlinearity, regularity in Sobolev space.

MSC: 35J92, 35J75, 35J47.

1 Introduction and Main Results

In this paper we are concerned with the system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = u^{-p}v^{-q}, u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_m v = u^{r}v^{-s}, v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N (N \geq 1)$ is a bounded and smooth domain, $1 < m < \infty$ and $p, q, r, s > 0$. Here, Δ_m is the m-Laplace operator defined as

$$\Delta_m u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{m-2}\nabla u).$$

The m-Laplace operator is used in mathematical models that arise in chemical reactions, psuedo-plastic flows, population dynamics, astrophysics, morphogenesis and many other applications. We

investigate the existence and uniqueness of weak solutions to system (1.1). By a solution of (1.1) we understand a pair (u, v) with u, $v \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega)$ that satifies u, $v > 0$ and

$$\begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{m-2}\nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi dx = \int_\Omega u^{-p} v^{-q} \phi dx & \text{for all } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega), \\ \displaystyle\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^{m-2}\nabla v \cdot \nabla \psi dx = \int_\Omega u^{r} v^{-s} \psi dx & \text{for all } \psi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega). \end{cases}$$

Systems of type (1.1) with all the exponents negative have been studied recently by Giacomoni, Schindler and Takac in [20]. They considered the system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{p_1} u = u^{-a_1} v^{-b_1}, u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_{p_2} v = u^{-b_2} v^{-a_2}, v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded and smooth domain, $1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty$ and $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 > 0$ are positive constants. They employed monotonicity methods in order to prove the existence and uniqueness of a positive solution (u, v) to (1.2) and they were able to get the regularity of solution in the Hölder Space $C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Systems of type (1.1) with all the exponents positive were studied by Clement, Fleckinger, Mitidieri and Thelin in [8]. They considered the following system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = u^{a_1} v^{b_1}, u > 0 & \text{in } B_R, \\ -\Delta_q v = u^{b_2} v^{a_2}, v > 0 & \text{in } B_R, \\ u = v = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where p, $q \geq 1$, $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \geq 0$ and B_R is an open ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Systems of type (1.1) have also been studied in [10, 16, 17, 19]. The singular semilinear case $p_1 = p_2 = 2$ in (1.2) has been studied even more frequently in [1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 22]. For instance, if $m = 2, p < 0$ and $q, r, s > 0$, system (1.1) corresponds to Gierer-Meinhardt system [21] in morphogenesis.

The existence of a solution (u, v) to system (1.1) is obtained under the following assumption on the exponents p, q, r and s

$$\frac{qr}{(1+p)(1+s)} < 1. \tag{1.4}$$

In order to obtain the existence of a solution (u, v) to (1.1) we employ the Schauder fixed point theorem in a closed convex subset of $C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega})$ which contains all the functions having a certain rate of decay expressed in terms of the distance function up to the boundary of Ω. This will be done by investigating the singular problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = K(x) u^{-p}, u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

where $m > 1$, $p \geq 0$ and $K : \Omega \to (0, \infty)$ is a positive function that behaves like $\delta(x)^{-q}$ where $\delta(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ and $q \geq 0$ satisfies

$$p\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) + q < 2 - \frac{1}{m}.$$

The existence of a positive weak solution u of (1.5) with

$$u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{if } p + q < 1$$

or

$$u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{if } p+q \geq 1$$

for some $\alpha, \beta \in (0,1)$ has been obtained in [3, 18, 20]. Problems of type (1.5) have been studied in [2, 4, 5] and the semilinear case $m = 2$ has been studied in [9, 11, 14, 15].

In fact, one can say more about the regularity of the solution u of (1.5). More precisely we obtain in Section 2 of this work that the unique weak solution u of (1.5) belongs to the Sobolev space $W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega)$ where

$$m \leq \tau < \frac{m+p-1}{p+q-1} \quad \text{if } p+q > 1,$$

and

$$m \leq \tau < \infty \quad \text{if } p+q = 1.$$

The $W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega)$ regularity we obtained on the above range of τ is optimal. This result also transfers to the regularity of solution (u,v) of (1.1) as we shall see below.

Throughout this paper, for any two functions f, g defined on Ω we shall write $f \sim g$ to denote that

$$c_1 \leq \frac{f}{g} \leq c_2 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

for some positive constants c_1 and c_2.

Our first result concerns the existence of a solution to (1.1).

Theorem 1.1. (**Existence)** *Assume (1.4). Let $m > 1$ and $p, q, r, s > 0$ satisfy*

$$p\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) + q < 2 - \frac{1}{m}$$

and

$$s\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) - r < 2 - \frac{1}{m}.$$

(i) *If $s - r > 1$ and $p + \frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1} < 1$, then (1.1) has a positive weak solution (u,v) such that $u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $v \in W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega) \cap C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta \in (0,1)$ and for all $m \leq \tau \leq \frac{m+s-1}{s-r-1}$. Also*

$$u(x) \sim \delta(x) \quad \text{and } v(x) \sim \delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}}.$$

(ii) *If $s - r > 1$ and $p + \frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1} = 1$, then (1.1) has a positive weak solution (u,v) such that $u \in W_0^{1,\tau_1}(\Omega) \cap C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and for all $m \leq \tau_1 < \infty$ and $v \in W_0^{1,\tau_2}(\Omega) \cap C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta \in (0,1)$ and for all $m \leq \tau_2 \leq \frac{m+s-1}{s-r-1}$. Also*

$$u(x) \sim \delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \quad \text{and } v(x) \sim \delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}}.$$

(iii) *If $s - r < 1$ and $p + q < 1$, then (1.1) has a positive weak solution (u,v) such that $u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $v \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta \in (0,1)$. Also*

$$u(x) \sim \delta(x) \quad \text{and } v(x) \sim \delta(x).$$

(iv) *If $s-r<1$ and $p+q=1$, then (1.1) has a positive weak solution (u,v) such that $u\in W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega)\cap C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha\in(0,1)$ and for all $m\le\tau<\infty$ and $v\in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega)\cap C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta\in(0,1)$. Also*

$$u(x)\sim\delta(x)\log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big)\quad \text{and } v(x)\sim\delta(x).$$

(v) *If $s-r=1$ and $p+q<1$, then (1.1) has a positive weak solution (u,v) such that $u\in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega)\cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha\in(0,1)$ and $v\in W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega)\cap C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta\in(0,1)$ and for all $m\le\tau<\infty$. Also*

$$u(x)\sim\delta(x)\quad \text{and } v(x)\sim\delta(x)\log^{\frac{1}{m+s-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big).$$

(vi) *If $s-r=1$ and $p+q=1$, then (1.1) has a positive weak solution (u,v) such that $u\in W_0^{1,\tau_1}(\Omega)\cap C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha\in(0,1)$ and for all $m\le\tau_1<\infty$ and $v\in W_0^{1,\tau_2}(\Omega)\cap C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta\in(0,1)$ and for all $m\le\tau_2<\infty$. Also*

$$u(x)\sim\delta(x)\log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big)\quad \text{and } v(x)\sim\delta(x)\log^{\frac{1}{m+s-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big).$$

(vii) *If $p+q>1$ and $s-\frac{r(m-q)}{m+p-1}<1$, then (1.1) has a positive weak solution (u,v) such that $u\in W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega)\cap C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha\in(0,1)$ and for all $m\le\tau<\frac{m+p-1}{p+q-1}$ and $v\in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega)\cap C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta\in(0,1)$. Also*

$$u(x)\sim\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}}\quad \text{and } v(x)\sim\delta(x).$$

(viii) *If $p+q>1$ and $s-\frac{r(m-q)}{m+p-1}=1$, then (1.1) has a positive weak solution (u,v) such that $u\in W_0^{1,\tau_1}(\Omega)\cap C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha\in(0,1)$ and for all $m\le\tau_1<\frac{m+p-1}{p+q-1}$ and $v\in W_0^{1,\tau_2}(\Omega)\cap C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta\in(0,1)$ and for all $m\le\tau_2<\infty$. Also*

$$u(x)\sim\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}}\quad \text{and } v(x)\sim\delta(x)\log^{\frac{1}{m+s-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big).$$

In our next result we discuss the uniqueness of a weak solution to (1.1).

Theorem 1.2. **(Uniqueness)** *Let $m>1$ and assume (1.4). If one of the following holds:*

(i) $s-r>1$ *and* $p+\frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1}<1$;

(ii) $p+q<1$ *and* $s-r\le1$;

(iii) $p+q=1$ *and* $s-r<1$;

(iv) $p+q>1$ *and* $s-\frac{r(m-q)}{m+p-1}<1$;

Then system (1.1) has a unique solution.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we collect some preliminary results which include several properties of the solution to the singular problem (1.5). Finally in Section 3 and Section 4 we give the proof of the main results.

2 Preliminary results

In this section we collect some preliminary results that will be useful in the study of (1.1)

Proposition 2.1. (see [20, Theorem 3.1]). *Let $1 < m < \infty$ and $u,\ v \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega)$ be positive functions satisfying the subsolution and supersolution inequalities*

$$-\Delta_m u \le K(x)u^{-\theta} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

$$-\Delta_m v \ge K(x)v^{-\theta} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

in the sense of distributions in $W^{-1,\frac{m}{m-1}}(\Omega)$, where $K : \Omega \to (0,\infty)$ is a positive function and $K \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$. Then

$$u \le v \quad \text{a.e in } \Omega.$$

Proposition 2.2. *Let (u,v) be a solution of (1.1). Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$u(x) \ge c\delta(x) \quad \text{and } v(x) \ge c\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Proof. Let w be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m w = C, \ \ w > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $C = ||u||_\infty^{-p}||v||_\infty^{-q} > 0$. Since w is m-superharmonic, by Hopf's Boundary Point lemma we have

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}(x_0) < 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

which gives

$$|\nabla w(x_0)| > c > 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad \text{for some positive constant } c.$$

Thus,

$$0 < c_1 < \Big|\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}(x_0)\Big| = \lim_{t\to 0^-} \frac{w(x_0 + t\nu)}{|t|}.$$

Hence, there exists $t_0 < 0$ such that

$$\frac{w(x_0 + t\nu)}{|t|} > c_1 \quad \text{for all } t \in (t_0, 0),$$

which further yields $w(x) \ge c_1|t| = c_1\delta(x)$. Using the definition of C and w above, we deduce that

$$-\Delta_m u \ge C = -\Delta_m w \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Using the Comparison Principle we obtain

$$u(x) \ge w(x) \ge c\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

In a similar way we prove that $v(x) \ge c\delta(x)$ in Ω.

□

Proposition 2.3. *Let $p \geq 0$ and $K : \Omega \to (0, \infty)$ be a continuous function such that $K(x) \sim \delta(x)^{-q}$, where $q \geq 0$ and $p\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) + q < 2 - \frac{1}{m}$. Then, the problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = K(x)u^{-p} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

has a unique solution $u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega)$ and:

(i) *If $p + q < 1$ then $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $u(x) \sim \delta(x)$.*

(ii) *If $p + q = 1$ then $u \in W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega) \cap C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and for all $m \leq \tau < \infty$. Also $u \sim \delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big)$.*

(iii) *If $p + q > 1$ then $u \in W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega) \cap C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and for all $m \leq \tau < \frac{m+p-1}{p+q-1}$. Also $u \sim \delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}}$.*

The key results in proving Proposition 2.3 are the following:

Proposition 2.4. *Let $u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$, $m > 1$ satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = \theta(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\theta : \Omega \to (0, \infty)$ is a continuous function.

(i) *If $\theta(x) \sim \delta(x)^{-a}$ for $a \in \Big(1, 2 - \frac{1}{m}\Big)$ then $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $p \in \Big[m, \frac{m-1}{a-1}\Big)$.*

(ii) *If $\theta(x) \sim \delta(x)^{-1} \log^{-a} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big)$ for $a \in (0, 1)$ then $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $p \in [m, \infty)$.*

Lemma 2.5. (see [23, Theorem 2]). *Assume $p \geq m > 1$, $u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega)$ and $\Phi \in L^{\frac{p}{m-1}}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfy*

$$\Delta_m u = \operatorname{div}(\Phi) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then $\nabla u \in L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ and there exist $c = c(m, p, N)$ such that

$$||\nabla u||_{L^p(\Omega)}^{m-1} \leq c||\Phi||_{L^{\frac{p}{m-1}}(\Omega)}.$$

Lemma 2.6. (see [9, Lemma 2] or [3, Lemma 4.4]). *There exist $c > 0$ such that if $B_{2r}(x_0) \subset \Omega$, $0 < r \leq 1$ and $v \in W_0^{2,p}(\Omega)$, for some $p > N$, then*

$$||\nabla v||_{L^\infty(B_r(x_0))} \leq c\Big[r||\Delta v||_{L^\infty(B_{2r}(x_0))} + \frac{1}{r}||v||_{L^\infty(B_{2r}(x_0))}\Big]. \tag{2.3}$$

Lemma 2.7. (see [24]). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded and smooth domain. Then*

$$\int_\Omega \delta(x)^{-a} dx < \infty \quad \text{if and only if } a < 1.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Let $w \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = \theta(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

Denote by $\phi > 0$ the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ in Ω.

(i) Assume $\theta(x) \sim \delta(x)^{-a}$ for some $a \in \left(1, 2 - \frac{1}{m}\right)$. Then

$$\underline{w}(x) = \frac{1}{c}\phi(x)^{2-a} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{w}(x) = c\phi(x)^{2-a}$$

are respectively sub and supersolutions of (2.4) provided $c > 1$ is large enough. Hence

$$w(x) \sim \delta(x)^{2-a}. \tag{2.5}$$

We claim that

$$|\nabla w(x)| \leq c\delta(x)^{1-a} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{2.6}$$

for some $c > 0$. To prove this, let $x \in \Omega$ be a fixed point and $r = \frac{\delta(x)}{3}$. Then

$$B_{2r}(x) \subset \Omega_0 = \{z \in \Omega : \frac{\delta(x)}{3} \leq \delta(z) \leq \frac{5}{3}\delta(x)\} \subset \Omega$$

and by Lemma 2.6 we have

$$|\nabla w(x)| \leq c\Big[r||\Delta w||_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)} + \frac{1}{r}||w||_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}\Big] \leq c\delta(x)^{1-a} \tag{2.7}$$

which proves (2.6). Using the estimate (2.6) we deduce that $|\nabla w| \in L^{\frac{p}{m-1}}(\Omega)$ whenever $\delta(x)^{1-a} \in L^{\frac{p}{m-1}}(\Omega)$ and by Lemma 2.7 this is equivalent to $p < \frac{m-1}{a-1}$. Using Lemma 2.5 with $\Phi = \nabla w$ we conclude the proof.

(ii) Assume now $\theta(x) \sim \delta(x)^{-1}\log^{-a}\left(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\right)$ for some $a \in (0,1)$. Then

$$\underline{w}(x) = \frac{1}{c}\phi(x)\log^{1-a}\Big(\frac{A}{\phi(x)}\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{w}(x) = c\phi(x)\log^{1-a}\Big(\frac{A}{\phi(x)}\Big)$$

are respectively sub and supersolutions of (2.4), where $A > 1$ is large. It follows that

$$w(x) \sim \delta(x)\log^{1-a}\Big(\frac{A}{\delta(x)}\Big). \tag{2.8}$$

Using (2.8) and a similar approach as in part(i) we deduce that

$$|\nabla w(x)| \leq c\log^{1-a}\Big(\frac{A}{\delta(x)}\Big) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where $A > 1 + \text{diam}(\Omega)$. In particular $|\nabla w| \in L^p(\Omega)$ for all $p > 1$ which, by Lemma 2.5 with $\Phi = \nabla w$, yields $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $p \in [m, \infty)$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 2.4.

□

Remark 2.8. The regularity of solution u in Proposition 2.4 is optimal. In order to see this, let (φ, λ) denote the first eigenfunction and eigenvalue of $-\Delta_m$ in Ω, that is

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m \varphi = \lambda |\nabla \varphi|^{m-2}\varphi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

It is well known that $\lambda > 0$, $\varphi \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\gamma \in (0,1)$ and φ has constant sign in Ω. Also $\varphi(x) \sim \delta(x)$. Thus, by normalizing φ we may assume $\varphi > 0$ in Ω and $||\varphi||_\infty = 1$. To show that the $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ regularity in Proposition 2.4(i) is optimal, let $\theta(x) = -\Delta_m(\varphi^{\frac{m-a}{m-1}})$. Some straightforward calculations yield

$$\theta(x) \sim \varphi(x)^{-a} \sim \delta(x)^{-a}.$$

Thus, $w = \varphi^{\frac{m-a}{m-1}}$ is a solution of (2.2) with

$$\theta(x) = -\Delta_m(\varphi^{\frac{m-a}{m-1}}).$$

Clearly $w \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $m \le p < \frac{m-1}{a-1}$. By Lemma 2.7, one has $w \notin W_0^{1,\frac{m-1}{a-1}}(\Omega)$.

Similarly, to show that the regularity $w \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $m \le p < \infty$ is optimal we take

$$\theta(x) = -\Delta_m\Big(\varphi \log^{1-a}\Big(\frac{A}{\varphi}\Big)\Big),$$

where $A > 1$ is a large constant.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. The existence of a solution $u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega)$ follows from [20, Theorem 3.2].

(i) If $p + q < 1$, then by [20, Theorem 2.1] we have $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

(ii) If $p + q = 1$, then by [20, Theorem 2.1] we have $u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta \in (0,1)$. Also, the behaviour $u \sim \delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big)$ follows in the same way as in [18, Lemma 3.3] by noting that

$$\underline{u}(x) = \frac{1}{c}\varphi(x)\log^{1-a}\Big(\frac{A}{\varphi(x)}\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{u}(x) = c\varphi(x)\log^{1-a}\Big(\frac{A}{\varphi(x)}\Big)$$

are respectively sub and supersolutions of (2.1) for some large $c > 1$. Using the asymptotic behaviour of u we deduce that

$$\theta(x) := K(x)u^{-p}(x) \sim \delta(x)^{-1}\log^{-\frac{p}{m+p-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big).$$

By Proposition 2.4(ii) it follows that $u \in W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega)$ for all $\tau \in [m, \infty)$.

(iii) If $p + q > 1$, then by [20, Theorem 2.1], we have $u \in W_0^{1,m}(\Omega) \cap C^{0,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\beta \in (0,1)$. Using the fact that

$$\underline{u}(x) = \frac{1}{c}\varphi(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{u}(x) = c\varphi(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}}$$

are respectively sub and supersolutions of (2.1) for some large $c > 1$, we easily deduce that

$$u \sim \delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}}.$$

Then

$$\theta(x) := K(x)u^{-p}(x) \sim \delta(x)^{-\frac{mp+(m-1)q}{m+p-1}},$$

and note that $a = \frac{mp+(m-1)q}{m+p-1} \in \left(1, 2-\frac{1}{m}\right)$. By Proposition 2.4(ii) it follows that $u \in W_0^{1,\tau}(\Omega)$ for all $\tau \in \left[m, \frac{m+p-1}{p+q-1}\right)$.

□

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

(i) Assume $s-r>1$ and $p+\frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1}<1$. By Proposition 2.3 (i) and (iii) there exist $0<c<d<1$ such that:

Any subsolution $\underline{v}$ and any supersolution $\overline{v}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v = \delta(x)^r v^{-s}, \ \ v>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v=0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{v} \le c\delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{v} \ge d\delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Any subsolution $\underline{u}$ and any supersolution $\overline{u}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = \delta(x)^{-\frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1}} u^{-p}, \ \ u>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u=0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{u} \le c\delta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{u} \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ (u,v) \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega}) : \begin{array}{ll} c_1\delta(x) \le u(x) \le c_2\delta(x) & \text{in } \Omega \\ m_1\delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \le v(x) \le m_2\delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} & \text{in } \Omega \end{array} \right\}$$

where $0<c_1<1<c_2$ and $0<m_1<1<m_2$ satisfy

$$d \ge c_1 m_2^{\frac{q}{1+p}}, \quad c \le c_2 m_1^{\frac{q}{1+p}}, \quad c c_2^{\frac{r}{1+s}} \le m_2, \quad d c_1^{\frac{r}{1+s}} \ge m_1, \tag{3.3}$$

that is

$$c_1 c_2^{\frac{qr}{(1+s)(1+p)}} \le d c^{\frac{-q}{1+p}} \le c d^{\frac{-q}{1+p}} \le c_2 c_1^{\frac{qr}{(1+s)(1+p)}}.$$

For any $(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}$ let (Tu, Tv) be the unique solution of the system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m(Tu) = (Tu)^{-p} v^{-q}, Tu>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_m(Tv) = (Tv)^{-s} u^r, Tv>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ Tu = Tv = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

and define

$$\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{A} \to C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{as} \quad \mathcal{F}(u,v) = (Tu, Tv) \quad \text{for any } (u,v) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

In order to prove the existence of a solution to system (1.1) we need to show that $\mathcal{F}$ has a fixed point in $\mathcal{A}$. We claim that:

(a) $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$,

(b) $\mathcal{F}$ is compact and continuous.

Then, by Schauder's fixed point theorem we obtain that $\mathcal{F}$ has a fixed point in $\mathcal{A}$ which is further a solution to the system (1.1).

Step 1: $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Let $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}$. From the definition of $\mathcal{A}$ we have

$$v \leq m_2 \delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then Tu satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m(Tu) \geq m_2^{-q} \delta(x)^{-\frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1}} (Tu)^{-p}, Tu > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ Tu = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

Therefore, $\overline{u} = m_2^{\frac{q}{1+p}} Tu$ is a supersolution of (3.2), which by (3.3) yields

$$Tu = m_2^{-\frac{q}{1+p}} \overline{u} \geq m_2^{-\frac{q}{1+p}} d\delta(x) \geq c_1 \delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Also, by the definition of $\mathcal{A}$

$$v \geq m_1 \delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Thus, by the definition of Tu we deduce that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m(Tu) \leq m_1^{-q} \delta(x)^{-\frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1}} (Tu)^{-p}, Tu > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ Tu = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

Therefore, $\underline{u} = m_1^{\frac{q}{1+p}} Tu$ is a subsolution of (3.2), which by (3.3) yields

$$Tu = m_1^{-\frac{q}{1+p}} \underline{u} \leq m_1^{-\frac{q}{1+p}} c\delta(x) \leq c_2 \delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

In a similar manner, by using the definition of $\mathcal{A}$ and the properties of subsolution and supersolution of problem (3.1), we obtain that Tv satisfies

$$m_1 \delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \leq Tv \leq m_2 \delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Hence, $(Tu, Tv) \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}$, that is, $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$.

Step 2: $\mathcal{F}$ *is compact and continuous.* Let $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $\mathcal{F}(u, v) = (Tu, Tv) \in \mathcal{A}$, using Proposition 2.3, we deduce that

$$Tu \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{and } Tv \in C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}),$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Since the embedding $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \hookrightarrow C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}) \hookrightarrow C(\overline{\Omega})$ is compact, it follows that $\mathcal{F}$ is compact.

In order to prove that $\mathcal{F}$ is continuous, let $\{(u_n, v_n)\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ be such that $u_n \to u$ and $v_n \to v$ in $C(\overline{\Omega})$ as $n \to \infty$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is compact, there exist $(U, V) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that up to a subsequence we have

$$Tu_n \to U, \ \ Tv_n \to V \quad \text{in } C(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

By Theorem 1 in [25], the sequences $\{Tu_n\}$ and $\{Tv_n\}$ are bounded in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega'})$ for any smooth open set $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$ with $\gamma \in (0,1)$. Thus, we have

$$Tu_n \to U, \;\; Tv_n \to V \quad \text{ in } C^1(\overline{\Omega'}) \quad \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

for any smooth open set $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$. Passing to the limit in the definition of Tu_n and Tv_n we deduce that (U, V) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m U = U^{-p} v^{-q}, U > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_m V = V^{-s} u^r, V > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ U = V = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

Since the solution to (3.4) is unique, it follows that $Tu = U$ and $Tv = V$. Therefore, we deduce that

$$Tu_n \to Tu, \;\; Tv_n \to Tv \quad \text{ in } C(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Hence $\mathcal{F}$ is continuous.

Here, we can apply the Schauder's fixed point theorem, there exists $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{F}(u, v) = (u, v)$, that is $Tu = u$ and $Tv = v$. Therefore, (u, v) is a solution to the system (1.1).

The remaining part of Theorem 1.1 is proved in the similar manner. We will only provide the necessary changes in order to carry out the proofs of (ii)-(viii).

(ii) Assume $s - r > 1$ and $p + \frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1} = 1$. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$s\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) - r(1-\varepsilon) < 2 - \frac{1}{m}.$$

By Proposition 2.3 (i)-(iii) there exist $0 < c < d < 1$ such that:

Any subsolution $\underline{v}$ and any supersolution $\overline{v}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v = \delta(x)^r v^{-s}, \;\; v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{v} \le c\delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \quad \text{ and } \quad \overline{v} \ge d\delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \quad \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Any subsolution $\underline{u}$ and any supersolution $\overline{u}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = \delta(x)^{-\frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1}} u^{-p}, \;\; u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{u} \le c'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \le c\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} \quad \text{ in } \Omega$$

and

$$\overline{u} \ge d'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \Big\{ (u,v) \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega}) : \begin{array}{ll} c_1\delta(x) \le u(x) \le c_2\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} & \text{in } \Omega \\ m_1\delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \le v(x) \le m_2\delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} & \text{in } \Omega \end{array} \Big\}$$

where $0 < c_1 < 1 < c_2$ and $0 < m_1 < 1 < m_2$ satisfy (3.3). The approach is now similar as in part (i).

(iii) Assume $s - r < 1$ and $p + q < 1$. By Proposition 2.3 (i)-(iii) there exist $0 < c < d < 1$ such that:

Any subsolution $\underline{v}$ and any supersolution $\overline{v}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v = \delta(x)^r v^{-s}, \ \ v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{v} \le c\delta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{v} \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Any subsolution $\underline{u}$ and any supersolution $\overline{u}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = \delta(x)^{-q} u^{-p}, \ \ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{u} \le c\delta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{u} \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \Big\{ (u,v) \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega}) : \begin{array}{ll} c_1\delta(x) \le u(x) \le c_2\delta(x) & \text{in } \Omega \\ m_1\delta(x) \le v(x) \le m_2\delta(x) & \text{in } \Omega \end{array} \Big\}$$

where $0 < c_1 < 1 < c_2$ and $0 < m_1 < 1 < m_2$ satisfy (3.3). The approach is now similar as in part (i).

(iv) Assume $s - r < 1$ and $p + q = 1$. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$s\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) - r(1-\varepsilon) < 2 - \frac{1}{m}.$$

By Proposition 2.3 (i)-(iii) there exist $0 < c < d < 1$ such that:

Any subsolution $\underline{v}$ and any supersolution $\overline{v}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v = \delta(x)^r v^{-s}, \ \ v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{v} \le c\delta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{v} \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Any subsolution $\underline{u}$ and any supersolution $\overline{u}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = \delta(x)^{-q} u^{-p}, \ \ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.13}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{u} \le c'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \le c\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} \quad \text{ in } \Omega$$

and

$$\overline{u} \ge d'\delta(x) log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \Big\{(u,v) \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega}) : \begin{array}{ll} c_1\delta(x) \le u(x) \le c_2\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} & \text{in } \Omega \\ m_1\delta(x) \le v(x) \le m_2\delta(x) & \text{in } \Omega \end{array} \Big\}$$

where $0 < c_1 < 1 < c_2$ and $0 < m_1 < 1 < m_2$ satisfy (3.3). The approach is now similar as in part (i).

(v) Assume $s - r = 1$ and $p + q < 1$. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$p\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) + q(1-\varepsilon) < 2 - \frac{1}{m}.$$

By Proposition 2.3 (i)-(iii) there exist $0 < c < d < 1$ such that:

Any subsolution $\underline{v}$ and any supersolution $\overline{v}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v = \delta(x)^{r} v^{-s}, \ \ v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.14}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{v} \le c'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+s-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \le c\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} \quad \text{ in } \Omega$$

and

$$\overline{v} \ge d'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+s-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Any subsolution $\underline{u}$ and any supersolution $\overline{u}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = \delta(x)^{-q(1-\varepsilon)} u^{-p}, \ \ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.15}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{u} \le c\delta(x) \quad \text{ and } \quad \overline{u} \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \Big\{(u,v) \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega}) : \begin{array}{ll} c_1\delta(x) \le u(x) \le c_2\delta(x) & \text{in } \Omega \\ m_1\delta(x) \le v(x) \le m_2\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} & \text{in } \Omega \end{array} \Big\}$$

where $0 < c_1 < 1 < c_2$ and $0 < m_1 < 1 < m_2$ satisfy (3.3). The approach is now similar as in part (i).

(vi) Assume $s - r = 1$ and $p + q = 1$. Choose $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$ small enough such that

$$p\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) + q(1 - \varepsilon) < 2 - \frac{1}{m}$$

and

$$s\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) - r(1 - \eta) < 2 - \frac{1}{m}.$$

By Proposition 2.3 (i)-(iii) there exist $0 < c < d < 1$ such that:

Any subsolution $\underline{v}$ and any supersolution $\overline{v}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v = \delta(x)^r v^{-s}, \ \ v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.16}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{v} \le c'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+s-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \le c\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

and

$$\overline{v} \ge d'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+s-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Any subsolution $\underline{u}$ and any supersolution $\overline{u}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = \delta(x)^{-q(1-\varepsilon)} u^{-p}, \ \ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.17}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{u} \le c'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \le c\delta(x)^{1-\eta} \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

and

$$\overline{u} \ge d'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \Big\{ (u, v) \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega}) : \begin{array}{ll} c_1\delta(x) \le u(x) \le c_2\delta(x)^{1-\eta} & \text{in } \Omega \\ m_1\delta(x) \le v(x) \le m_2\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} & \text{in } \Omega \end{array} \Big\}$$

where $0 < c_1 < 1 < c_2$ and $0 < m_1 < 1 < m_2$ satisfy (3.3). The approach is now similar as in part (i).

(vii) Assume $p + q > 1$ and $s - \frac{r(m-q)}{m+p-1} < 1$. By Proposition 2.3 (i)-(iii) there exist $0 < c < d < 1$ such that:

Any subsolution $\underline{u}$ and any supersolution $\overline{u}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = \delta(x)^{-q} u^{-p}, \ \ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{u} \le c\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{u} \ge d\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Any subsolution $\underline{v}$ and any supersolution $\overline{v}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v = \delta(x)^{\frac{r(m-q)}{m+p-1}} v^{-s}, \ \ v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.19}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{v} \le c\delta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{v} \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \Big\{ (u,v) \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega}) : \begin{array}{cc} c_1\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} \le u(x) \le c_2\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ m_1\delta(x) \le v(x) \le m_2\delta(x) & \text{in } \Omega \end{array} \Big\}$$

where $0 < c_1 < 1 < c_2$ and $0 < m_1 < 1 < m_2$ satisfy (3.3). The approach is now similar as in part (i).

(viii) Assume $p + q > 1$ and $s - \frac{r(m-q)}{m+p-1} = 1$. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$p\Big(1 - \frac{1}{m}\Big) + q(1-\varepsilon) < 2 - \frac{1}{m}.$$

By Proposition 2.3 (i)-(iii) there exist $0 < c < d < 1$ such that:

Any subsolution $\underline{u}$ and any supersolution $\overline{u}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u = \delta(x)^{-q} u^{-p}, \ \ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.20}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{u} \le c\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{u} \ge d\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Any subsolution $\underline{v}$ and any supersolution $\overline{v}$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v = \delta(x)^{\frac{r(m-q)}{m+p-1}} v^{-s}, \ \ v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \qquad v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.21}$$

satisfies

$$\underline{v} \le c'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+s-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \le c\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

and

$$\overline{v} \ge d'\delta(x) \log^{\frac{1}{m+s-1}} \Big(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\Big) \ge d\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \Big\{ (u,v) \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega}) : \begin{array}{cc} c_1\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} \le u(x) \le c_2\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} & \text{in } \Omega \\ m_1\delta(x) \le v(x) \le m_2\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} & \text{in } \Omega \end{array} \Big\}$$

where $0 < c_1 < 1 < c_2$ and $0 < m_1 < 1 < m_2$ satisfy (3.3). The approach is now similar as in part (i).

4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

(i) Assume $s - r > 1$ and $p + \frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1} < 1$. Let (u_1, v_1) and (u_2, v_2) be two solutions of system (1.1). By Proposition 2.2, there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$u_i(x),\ \ v_i(x) \geq c_1\delta(x) \quad \text{ in } \Omega,\ i = 1, 2. \tag{4.1}$$

Using $u_i(x) \geq c_1\delta(x)$ in Ω, we deduce that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v_i \geq c_2\delta(x)^r v_i^{-s},\ \ u_i > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad v_i = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

satisfies

$$v_i(x) \geq c_3\delta(x)^{\frac{m+r}{m+s-1}} \quad \text{ in } \Omega,\ i = 1, 2. \tag{4.2}$$

Using (4.2) we deduce that u_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u_i \leq c_4\delta(x)^{-\frac{q(m+r)}{m+s-1}} u_i^{-p},\ \ u_i > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad u_i = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

so

$$u_i \leq c_5\delta(x) \quad \text{ in } \Omega,\ i = 1, 2. \tag{4.3}$$

By (4.1) and (4.3), there exists $c \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$c\delta(x) \leq u_i(x) \leq \frac{1}{c}\delta(x), \quad \text{ in } \Omega\ i = 1, 2.$$

Therefore, we can find a constant $C > 1$ such that

$$Cu_1 \geq u_2 \quad \text{ and } \quad Cu_2 \geq u_1 \quad \text{ in } \Omega.$$

We claim that $u_1 \geq u_2$ in Ω. Let us suppose by contradiction that

$$M := \inf\{A > 1 : Au_1 \geq u_2 \text{ in } \Omega\} > 1.$$

Clearly $Mu_1 \geq u_2$ in Ω. Therefore, it follows that

$$-\Delta_m v_2 \leq M^r u_1^r v_2^{-s} \quad \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Thus, v_1 is a solution and $M^{-\frac{r}{1+s}} v_2$ is subsolution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m z = u_1^r z^{-s},\ \ z > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad z = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

which by Proposition 2.1 gives

$$M^{-\frac{r}{1+s}} v_2 \leq v_1 \quad \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Using the above inequality, we have

$$-\Delta_m u_1 \leq M^{\frac{qr}{1+s}} u_1^{-p} v_2^{-q} \quad \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Thus, u_2 is a solution and $M^{-\frac{qr}{(1+p)(1+s)}}u_1$ is subsolution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m w = w^{-p}v_2^{-q}, \ \ w>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w=0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

which by Proposition 2.1 gives

$$u_1 \le M^{\frac{qr}{(1+p)(1+s)}}u_2 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

This contradicts the minimality of M as

$$\frac{qr}{(1+p)(1+s)} < 1.$$

Hence $u_1 \ge u_2$ in Ω. Similarly we have $u_2 \ge u_1$ in Ω, so $u_1 \equiv u_2$ which also yields $v_1 \equiv v_2$. Thus, the system (1.1) has unique solution.

(ii) Assume $s-r \le 1$ and $p+q<1$. Let (u_1,v_1) and (u_2,v_2) be two solutions of (1.1). By Proposition 2.2, there exists a constant $c_1>0$ such that

$$u_i(x), \ \ v_i(x) \ge c_1\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \ i=1,2. \tag{4.4}$$

Using $v_i(x) \ge c_1\delta(x)$ in Ω, we deduce that u_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u_i \le c_2\delta(x)^{-q}u_i^{-p}, \ \ u_i>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i=0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

so

$$u_i(x) \le c_3\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \ i=1,2. \tag{4.5}$$

By (4.4) and (4.5), there exists $c\in(0,1)$ such that

$$c\delta(x) \le u_i(x) \le \frac{1}{c}\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \ i=1,2.$$

Further, the approach is similar to that in case (i).

(iii) Assume $p+q=1$ and $s-r<1$. Let $\varepsilon>0$ be small enough such that $s-r(1-\varepsilon)<1$. Let (u_1,v_1) and (u_2,v_2) be two solutions of (1.1). By Proposition 2.2, there exists a constant $c_1>0$ such that

$$u_i(x), \ \ v_i(x) \ge c_1\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \ i=1,2. \tag{4.6}$$

Using $v_i(x) \ge c_1\delta(x)$ in Ω, we deduce that u_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u_i \le c_2\delta(x)^{-q}u_i^{-p}, \ \ u_i>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i=0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

so

$$u_i(x) \le c_3\delta(x)\log^{\frac{1}{m+p-1}}\left(\frac{1}{\delta(x)}\right) \le c_4\delta(x)^{1-\varepsilon} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \ i=1,2. \tag{4.7}$$

Using (4.7) we deduce that v_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v_i \le c_5\delta(x)^{r(1-\varepsilon)}v_i^{-s}, \ \ v_i>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v_i=0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

so

$$v_i \leq c_6\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega,\ i=1,2. \tag{4.8}$$

By (4.6) and (4.8), there exists $c \in (0,1)$ such that

$$c\delta(x) \leq v_i(x) \leq \frac{1}{c}\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega,\ i=1,2. \tag{4.9}$$

Further, the approach is similar to that in case (i).

(iv) Assume $p+q>1$ and $s-\frac{r(m-q)}{m+p-1}<1$. Let (u_1,v_1) and (u_2,v_2) be two solutions of system (1.1). By Proposition 2.2, there exists a constant $c_1>0$ such that

$$u_i(x),\ \ v_i(x) \geq c_1\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega,\ i=1,2. \tag{4.10}$$

Using $v_i(x) \geq c_1\delta(x)$ in Ω, we deduce that u_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m u_i \leq c_2\delta(x)^{-q}u_i^{-p},\ \ u_i>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

so

$$u_i(x) \leq c_3\delta(x)^{\frac{m-q}{m+p-1}} \quad \text{in } \Omega,\ i=1,2. \tag{4.11}$$

Using (4.11) we deduce that v_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_m v_i \leq c_4\delta(x)^{\frac{r(m-q)}{m+p-1}}v_i^{-s},\ \ v_i>0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v_i = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

so

$$v_i \leq c_5\delta(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega,\ i=1,2. \tag{4.12}$$

By (4.10) and (4.12), there exists $c \in (0,1)$ such that

$$c\delta(x) \leq v_i(x) \leq \frac{1}{c}\delta(x), \quad \text{in } \Omega,\ i=1,2.$$

Therefore, we can find a constant $C>1$ such that

$$Cv_1 \geq v_2 \quad \text{and} \quad Cv_2 \geq v_1 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

From now on we proceed in the same manner as in case (i). This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Acknowledgement. This work is part of the author's PhD thesis and has been carried out with the financial support of the Research Demonstratorship Scheme offered by the School of Mathematics and Statistics, University College Dublin.

References

[1] S. Barile, A. Salvatore, Existence and multiplicity results for some Lane-Emden elliptic systems: Subquadratic case, *Advances in Nonlinear Analysis* **4** (2014), 25–35.

[2] P. Benilan, L. Boccardo, T. Gallouet, R. Gariepy, M. Pierre, J.L. Vazquez, An L^1 theory of existence and uniqueness of nonlinear elliptic equations, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **22** (1995), 241–273.

[3] B. Bougherara, J. Giacomoni, J. Hernandez, Existence and regularity of weak solutions for singular elliptic problems, http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.00796.

[4] L. Boccardo, L. Orsina, Semilinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **37** (2009), 363–380.

[5] L.M.D. Cave, Nonlinear elliptic equations with singular nonlinearities, *Anymptotic Analysis* **84** (2013), 181–195.

[6] Y.S. Choi, P.J. McKenna, A singular Gierer-Meinhardt system of elliptic equations, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire* **17** (2000), 503–522.

[7] Y.S. Choi, P.J. McKenna, A singular Gierer-Meinhardt system of elliptic equations: the classical case, *Nonlinear Anal., T.M.A.* **55** (2003), 521–541.

[8] Ph. Clement, J. Fleckinger, E. Mitidieri, F. de Thelin, Existence of positive solutions for a nonvariational quasilinear elliptic system, *J. Differential Equations* **166** (2000), 455–477.

[9] M. Crandell, P.H. Rabinowitz, L. Tartar, On a Dirichlet problem with a singular nonlinearity, *Comm. P.D.E* **2** (1977), 193–222.

[10] M. Cuesta, P. Takac, Nonlinear eigenvalue problems for degenerate elliptic systems, *Differential Integral Equations* **23** (2010), 1117–1138.

[11] M. Ghergu, V. Rădulescu, Sublinear singular elliptic problems with two parameters, *J. Differential Equations* **195** (2003), 520–536.

[12] M. Ghergu, Lane-Emden systems with negative exponents, *J. Functional Analysis* **258** (2010), 3295–3318.

[13] M. Ghergu, A Lane-Emden system with singular data, *Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh Sect.A* **141** (2011), 1279–1294.

[14] M. Ghergu, V. Rădulescu, Singular elliptic problems: bifurcation and asymptotic analysis, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 2008.

[15] C. Gui, F.-H. Lin, Regularity of an elliptic problem with a singular nonlinearity, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **123** (1993), 1021–1029.

[16] J. Giacomoni, J. Hernandez, Quasilinear and singular systems: the cooperative case, *Contemp. Math.* **540** (2011).

[17] J. Giacomoni, J. Hernandez, Quasilinear and singular elliptic systems, *Adv. Nonlinear Anal.* **2** (2013), 1–41.

[18] J. Giacomoni, H. Maagli, P. Sauvy, Existence of compact support solutions for a quasilinear and singular problem, *Differential Integral Equations* **25** (2012), 629–659.

[19] J. Giacomoni, I. Schindler, P. Takac, Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizers and existence of multiple solutions for a singular quasilinear equation, *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.(5)* **6** (2007), 117–158.

[20] J. Giacomoni, I. Schindler, P. Takac, Singular quasilinear elliptic systems and Hölder regularity, *Adv. Differential Equations* **20** (2015), 259–298.

[21] A. Gierer, H. Meinhardt, A theory of biological pattern formation, *Kybernetik* **12** (1972), 30–39.

[22] J. Hernandez, F.J. Mancebo, J.M. Vega, Positive solutions for singular semilinear elliptic systems, *Adv. Differential Equations* **13** (2008), 857–880.

[23] T. Iwaniec, Projections onto gradient fields and L^p-estimates for degenerate elliptic operators, *Studia Math.* **75** (1983), 293–312.

[24] A.C. Lazer, P.J. McKenna, On a singular nonlinear elliptic boundary value problem, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **111** (1991), 721–730.

[25] P. Tolksdorf, Regularity for more general class of quasilinear elliptic equations, *J. Differential Equations* **51** (1984), 126-150.